UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2506th MEETING: 19 DECEMBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2506) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2506th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 19 December 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Max VAN DER STOEL (Netherlands).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2506)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2504th and 2505th meetings*], I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Portugal, Somalia, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Ould Hamody (Mauritania), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Anyaoku (Nigeria), Mr. Medina (Portugal), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Benin and Ethiopia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose with the consent of the Council to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ogouma (Benin) and Mr. Seifu (Ethiopia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 December from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which reads as follows:

> "On behalf of the Special Committee, I have the honour to request, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to be invited to participate in the Council's consideration of the complaint by Angola against South Africa."

4. On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

It was so decided.

5. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): Once again the Council has met to consider the complaint of an African State

against the South African Republic, but today's debate differs from previous ones because of the seriousness of the accusations which have been levelled against Pretoria. It is not only a question of selective attacks and of more or less brief incursions. To quote the actual terms of the letter of the representative of Angola, above all it is a question of "the occupation since 1981 of parts" of the southern part of that country by the South African armed forces.

6. My delegation listened with extreme attention to the statement made by Mr. de Figueiredo [*2504th meeting*]. We should like to assure him of the profound sympathy of the French Government for the Angolan people, who have not known a day of peace since their independence and who regularly have to cope with murderous raids and serious devastation.

7. France is resolutely on the side of Angola in this test. The relationship of friendship and co-operation which unites our two countries has been considerably strengthened. Our political dialogue has never been so intense, as is indicated by the visit which has just been made to Luanda by President Mitterrand's Adviser on African affairs.

8. The position of my country is without ambiguity. France condemns any occupation, wherever it occurs in the world. Hence, we condemn the two-year-old occupation of the southern part of Angola by South African armed forces. Today we once again condemn this typical attack against Angolan sovereignty. We demand the withdrawal of South African troops and respect by that country for the territorial integrity of Angola.

9. In this connection, my delegation has taken note of the letter which the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information addressed on 15 December to the Secretary-General [*S/16219, annex I*]. This letter is deserving of close scrutiny, and we await the opinion of the Secretary-General on it.

10. Nevertheless, my delegation can already state that it deeply deplores the fact that the South African Minister in that letter reiterates the position of his country, asserting a "linkage" between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and a matter which is exclusively germane to the sovereignty of Angola.

11. On 27 May of this year [*2447th meeting*], my delegation made a solemn appeal to South Africa in this very chamber, warning it against the risks of violence breaking out throughout the region. Today I reiterate that appeal. The mechanism of peace must now be set in motion. It depends above all on the South African Government whether or not this comes to pass.

12. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Mr. President, we of the Zimbabwe delegation are exceedingly happy that the Council is considering the situation in Angola under your wise and careful guidance. We are happy, too, that your very rich past experience and well-known diplomatic skills, as well as your profound knowledge of the unhappy situation prevailing in the whole southern African region, will be brought to bear upon our deliberations. I wish to assure you of my delegation's full co-operation with you in your efforts to find correct and just solutions to the question before the Council now, and any other questions arising during the rest of your presidency.

13. Through you, Mr. President, I also wish to express my delegation's admiration for the most exemplary manner in which your predecessor, our dear colleague and friend Mr. Gauci, representative of Malta, performed the duties of President last month.

14. The Council is meeting now because parts of southern Angolan territory have been continuously occupied by the armed forces of the racist Pretoria régime since August 1981, gravely violating Angola's territorial integrity and also threatening its security, peace and national sovereignty. Moreover, *apartheid* South Africa's military occupation of Angolan territory during these past 28 months represents a very serious violation of the sacred purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which, *inter alia*, enjoin any Members of the United Nations that find themselves involved in disputes to settle such disputes peacefully, in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

15. It has been observed, and correctly too, that since their independence in 1975 the main and most pressing preoccupation or concern of the Angolan people has been a desperate quest for security, peace and the consolidation of its very hard-won freedom and sovereignty. This has been so because Angola, under its Revolutionary Government, the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), has been and continues to be the target of Pretoria's unprovoked aggression. The massive invasion of 1981, which led to the continuous military occupation of parts of southern Angola, must therefore be correctly seen as a dramatic escalation of South Africa's long-declared policy of brutal aggression against and destabilization of Angola.

16. Equally true is the observation that Pretoria's continuous campaigns of naked aggression and intimidation against Angola in violation of the Charter and of international law have only been matched by the MPLA leadership's deep faith and trust in the United Nations and especially in the Council, the only body primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Angola's deep respect for international law and its faith in the purposes and principles of the Organization are a matter of public record, as the Council was reminded by the representative of Angola in his statement on 16 December [*2504th meeting*]. The Angolan Government, its representative reminded us,

has appealed to the Council in March 1976, May 1978, March and November 1979, June 1980 and August 1981.

17. Why should the *apartheid* Pretoria régime be allowed to undermine and threaten the bedrock principles of international law with such impunity? When will the Council take appropriate measures to restrain that régime's persistent campaigns of terror and murder against Angola? Or does the Council accept the South African Government representative's justification of his Government's criminal behaviour—that is, as he told the Council on 16 December [*ibid.*], that South Africa's military occupation of southern Angola is for the protection of Namibians against the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)?

18. Such an assertion is totally unacceptable to the oppressed masses of Namibia and is extremely offensive to the peoples of our region and the African continent. How arrogant of a régime which has been militarily occupying Namibia in defiance of United Nations decisions and resolutions for decades. The Council must reject any attempt to justify *apartheid* aggression against Angola, for there are no circumstances, either in the Charter or in international law governing inter-State relations, in which the invasion and occupation of one State by another can be justified. Moreover, Angola, which shares no common border with South Africa, poses no threat to that country. It must also be borne in mind that while South Africa has been carrying out numerous air and ground attacks in Angola, killing and maiming defenceless civilians and committing acts of sabotage against vital economic installations and infrastructure, not a single Angolan soldier has been seen on South African soil.

19. If South Africa is really seriously looking for SWAPO freedom fighters, as we have been told, then it should direct its murderous forces where SWAPO fighters are to be found—in Namibia itself. The South African Government knows as well as, if not even better than, any of us here that SWAPO freedom fighters are not in Angola or, for that matter, in any independent State in the region, but inside Namibia itself. Indeed, an examination of the list of SWAPO attacks against the South African forces, as furnished by the South African representative here on 16 December, will show that the Namibian liberation war is being fought inside Namibia and not in Angola.

20. We must make it very clear that we of the front-line States and Nigeria are very gravely concerned about racist South Africa's continued military occupation of parts of southern Angola. We are also convinced that this concern is shared by all justice-loving and peace-loving peoples. Accordingly, we join Angola in demanding that régime's denunciation and condemnation by the Council. We also support Angola's demand that the régime be required to cease its hostile acts and to withdraw its occupation forces forthwith and unconditionally. Moreover, as South Africa's aggression and military occupation of southern Angola have caused massive losses of human lives and in material terms, the Pretoria Government should pay full compensation to Angola.

21. South Africa's bogus announcement on 15 December [*S/16219, annex I*] that it was considering a disengagement of its murderous forces from Angola on 31 January 1984 should not deceive anyone here. If South Africa is really serious about disengaging from Angola, it should demonstrate its seriousness by action, that is, by pulling its forces from that country forthwith and unconditionally. The fact that this so-called intention to disengage has been qualified with conditions simply reduces the announcement to a mere restating of the linkage issue, which has been soundly condemned and totally rejected by the Security Council, by the General Assembly, by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). South Africa must be told in no uncertain terms that the Council has no intention of buying this old and threadbare hat, now or in future. The Council and the entire international community are now quite familiar with the racist régime's doubletrack strategy of talking about peace while its troops are advancing deep into Angolan territory.

22. Nothing but the immediate and unconditional calling off of hostilities against Angola, followed by the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's forces, will convince us of South Africa's seriousness about disengagement. Consequently, therefore, we sincerely request the Council to adopt the draft resolution to be put before it [*S/16226*], as we are convinced that such a move by the Council will be a modest contribution towards peace and security for Angola.

23. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before turning to the subject before us, I should like to express the satisfaction of my delegation at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the Council. Your country and mine have splendid relations based on mutual respect and understanding.

24. South Africa's policy of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of Angola goes back to a time prior to the independence of that fraternal country, when South Africa tried in vain to halt the progress of the national liberation movements and struggles in Angola and Mozambique and to perpetuate colonial domination and exploitation in southern Africa.

25. The people's victories in Mozambique and Angola under the leadership of the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) and the MPLA constitute a risk, in the estimation of the imperialists, to their neocolonial strategy in that part of Africa and a threat to South African colonial domination in Namibia. To thwart the MPLA victory, the Pretoria Government gave massive support to other pro-imperialist movements. Against

the determination of the Angolan people, however, all these manoeuvres were useless, and the MPLA was the victor, the indisputable repository of the power of the fraternal people of Angola.

26. Recent history shows us that from 1975 on, South Africa's policy of aggression against Angola was stepped up alarmingly. South African armed forces have been widely used, particularly the South African Defence Force (SADF). The struggle of the Angolan people has not ceased. It is an incomparable struggle which takes many forms. It is an anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist struggle; it is a struggle for independence, sovereignty and dignity. All these years, starting with the proclamation of Angola's independence by that outstanding patriot Agostinho Neto on 11 November 1975, have been difficult years during which there has been a strong determination to win, and the courage of the Angolan people and international solidarity have inflicted defeat after defeat on colonialist and imperialist forces. Between March 1976 and June 1979, regular forces of the South African army have caused the deaths of at least 570 Angolans, 612 Namibians and 198 Zimbabwians, the latter who had been made refugees by conditions in their places of origin at the time of the events involved. South African aggression during that period also caused financial losses of $293.3 million.

27. During all that time and still to this day, South Africa has maintained an undeclared war against Angola involving thousands of soldiers equipped with the most modern weapons. This state of affairs became particularly serious from 1981 on. Inspired, stimulated and encouraged by aggressive and bellicose statements by the Reagan Administration, which had recently come to power, the South African Government carried out its sinister plans of aggression on a major scale, which concluded with the infamous "Operation Protea" in August that year. That criminal military operation involved 11,000 South African soldiers, more than 100 tanks, missiles, almost 100 military aircraft and, in sum, all the machinery of extermination. No change of policy has taken place since then. Vast expanses of Angolan territory are still occupied by thousands of South African soldiers, and the Angolan people continues to be victim of South Africa's policy of aggression and occupation.

28. At this stage, no one can ignore the fact that Angola has been constantly subjected to an unequal war which, because of the support or indifference of the "champions of freedom and democracy" in our hemisphere, has legitimized whatever means have been used by that fraternal country for its defence. Given this undeniable situation, Angola, in exercise of its sovereign will, has appealed to international solidarity in order to reinforce its lines of defence and to cope with a numerically superior enemy filled with mercenaries, the same kind of mercenaries as those who fill the pages of the magazine *Soldier of Fortune*, which month after month narrates the deeds that these mercenaries are continuing to perpetrate against the peoples of Angola and Namibia as if they were epic feats.

29. During the same year 1981—which for Angola and Nicaragua marked an aggravation of aggression for identical reasons—the United States Administration, going against all common sense and logic, in order to abort talks which were under way, invented the so-called "linkage" or "parallelism" which would tie the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. This pretext has been firmly rejected by the international community, and only the United States and South Africa still cling desperately to it. Why is South Africa demanding the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola? Why does it feel threatened? In any case, Angola is not a neighbouring country to South Africa, since vast territories separate the two countries: Namibia and Botswana are between them. Only the guilty criminal conscience of South Africa could feel threatened. Angola, for its part, has demonstrated a consistent policy of honesty and decency. The Angolans are peace-loving people who have never attacked, nor do they wish to attack, anyone. They wish to live in peace and fight only against underdevelopment and for a future of well-being and progress. It is a right which must be allowed all peoples —the people of Nicaragua and the people of Angola— whose dignity and freedom have been historically taken away, and, today when they are recovered, are trying to maintain that dignity and freedom at the cost of pain, heroism and sacrifice.

30. The only "linkage" or "parallelism" that can be established in this situation of Angola is the similarity between it and other situations of aggression that other peoples are suffering under, like the Nicaraguan people. In each of those cases a major Power, through its policeman in the area, is making threats and carrying out acts of aggression and destabilization, using mercenary troops. Our vehemence in denouncing the situation in Angola is legitimate, since we have had personal experience with the consequences of the actions of a Power which believes it has the right to act lawlessly whenever it wishes, and feels it can dictate to other countries what democracy means and how they should organize their economic, political and social systems. Our vehemence is due also to the shared pain of our peoples, our solidarity and our fraternal spirit, our awareness that Angola and Nicaragua are waging a similar struggle against a common enemy, for independence, national sovereignty, social justice, freedom and dignity.

31. Today the Council has a responsibility to fulfil with regard to the people of Angola. The injustice with which we must deal is not and cannot be a subject for debate. Is there any kind of "international law" that declares South Africa's unlawful occupation of Angola to be legal? It seems to us that only in the philosophical and political schemes of the United States Administration would such conduct be permissible. After "Operation Protea" in 1981, the represen-

tative of the United States vetoed the draft resolution [*S/14664/Rev.2*] which condemned South Africa and demanded the withdrawal of its troops. Because of that veto the unlawful occupation of part of the territory of Angola continues, and once again we have before us this same problem to consider.

32. Let us not deceive ourselves. South Africa has engaged in a new manoeuvre, outlined in the letter of 15 December of this year from the Foreign Minister of the racist régime to the Secretary-General [*S/16219, annex I*], in which the Government of South Africa talks about the "disengagement" of the forces of occupation and persists in its determination to link the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. That letter is one more insult to the fraternal Republic of Angola and to the international community, for it tries to present as a concession what is no more than an unfulfilled obligation that has been ignored for many years. This recent manoeuvre must also be rejected by the international community, for it brings nothing new or positive but merely reiterates unlawful and unacceptable conditions that have already been universally repudiated.

33. We would reiterate that Angola must not be asked to make any kind of concession, nor must any conditions be imposed on it. It is South Africa which must unconditionally withdraw its occupation forces. It is South Africa which must compensate Angola for the tremendous damages caused its people during these years of occupation and aggression. It is South Africa on which, for the good of mankind, codes of conduct must be imposed. It is that régime which has traditionally violated international law and the resolutions of the United Nations and will continue to do so as long as it has the support of its powerful allies and the protection of the "constructive engagement" it maintains with one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

34. To conclude, we wish to indicate how impressed we were with the questions raised by the representative of Angola in his statement before the Council on 16 December—questions which cause us to reflect, because of their validity in respect to all the occasions on which the Council has not faced up to its obligations. We join in the cry of anguish of the Angolan people and repeat here those key questions:

> "In the face of the Council's impotence and inability to help Angola, the victim of racist aggression, in the face of its paralysis because of the veto exercised by a super-Power, to what court of justice should the people of Angola turn? In which international forum should we seek redress? Which international organization will deliver Angola—and, indeed, all of southern Africa—from the criminal madness of this monster in our midst?" [*2504th meeting, para. 18.*]

35. Mr. NATORF (Poland): At the very outset, Sir, I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of December. It is the profound conviction of my delegation that under your able guidance, which stems from your diplomatic skill and experience, the Council will successfully discharge its responsibilities.

36. May I also take this opportunity to express our high appreciation to Mr. Gauci, of Malta, who conducted our proceedings in the month of November in the most exemplary and efficient manner.

37. My delegation wishes to state its position on the Angolan request that the Council consider again the continued aggression being perpetrated against that country by the racist régime of South Africa. The military aggression of the Pretoria régime should be a subject of most serious concern for every Member of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular.

38. This is not the first time that Angola has presented its case before the Council. In its resolution 387 (1976), the Council demanded respect for Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity; in its resolution 428 (1978), it demanded an unconditional withdrawal of all South African forces from Angola, and repeated these calls in resolutions 447 (1979), 454 (1979), 475 (1980) and others. The facts about the South African aggression against Angola cannot be denied by anyone; they are beyond a shadow of a doubt. The brutality of South African military actions has been confirmed by numerous United Nations fact-finding missions, and have been reported in the press and by other witnesses. The massive and prolonged presence of the racist troops on a part of Angolan soil, as well as their terrorist acts in the period 1975 to mid-1982, have been amply presented in a White Paper which the Angolan Government has had circulated [*S/16198, annex*]. The representative of Angola furnished us with new evidence confirming the seriousness of the situation [*2504th meeting*].

39. It is clear and beyond any doubt that Angola is a victim of continued aggression, with all the dramatic consequences and implications that has for that country and for the international situation as well. The territorial integrity of Angola has been violated. South African forces and mercenaries have penetrated as deep as 100 miles inside Angolan territory, inflicting destruction, sowing terror, bringing death and causing suffering among the civilian Angolan population and Namibian refugees. On-the-ground military operations and aircraft attacks are frequent. The damage to the Angolan economy is serious. The reports on brutalities of South African forces multiply.

40. These actions have been the subject of condemnation not only by the United Nations. In this respect the representative of India reminded us of the position of his country, of the movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and of the Commonwealth Heads of Government at their meeting at New Delhi. The Political Declaration of the State Parties to the Warsaw Treaty adopted at

Prague on 5 January 1983 also condemned South Africa for its unlawful occupation of Namibia and for converting that occupied African Territory into a base for aggression against neighbouring African States [*see S/15556, annex*].

41. We heard the claim by the representative of South Africa that steps had been taken "with a view to facilitating the process of achieving a peaceful settlement" [*see S/16219, annex I*]. Those claims were designed as a smoke-screen to hide the real intentions of his Government.

42. As was emphasized by the representative of India in his statement on 16 December, it is clear that "this is yet another diversionary tactic which is part of the overall strategy of South Africa" [*2504th meeting, para. 67*].

43. Those South African claims were accompanied by unfounded charges and allegations kept in the tone of impudence and audacious warnings. Carefully selected words from the ideological vocabulary of anti-communism were used, some to intimidate South Africa's neighbours, others to please certain listeners with the colourful vision of South African commando troops and notorious mercenaries in the defense of African rampart from communism.

44. The ideological smoke-screen thrown up by South Africa is not thick enough, however, to cover the real racist face of the Pretoria régime. The people of Poland know well what racism means. In the not-so-distant past they themselves were the victims of this dreadful theory and practice which, combined with militarism, led to Nazi aggression against Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War. They will never forget it. This is one of the reasons why my country renders its unswerving support to Angola and other African States, victims of the policy of aggression of South Africa.

45. The statement by the representative of the South African régime proves that his Government continues to neglect the clearly expressed will of the international community. Its implications are extremely serious, as it implies an alleged South African right to continue military actions against Angola and to keep a South African military presence there. The Council cannot remain indifferent in the face of these threats.

46. We would also expect that those Western countries which continue to collaborate, politically and militarily, with the Pretoria régime will stop doing so and will strictly implement the 11 Security Council resolutions, including resolution 418 (1977) concerning the arms embargo against South Africa.

47. The situation created on the Angolan border constitutes a serious violation of the Charter of the United Nations and should be treated as such. At the same time, we are faced with the persistence of South African intransigence and belligerence. It is time now to step beyond mere condemnations of South African aggression and calls to withdraw its forces from Angola. If the Council is to carry out its primary responsibility for restoring international peace and stability in the south of Africa, we must be prepared to adopt appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

48. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): The Security Council has been considering complaints of aggression by South Africa against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola ever since Angola's independence in 1975. The first such complaint was brought to the Council in 1976 by the Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations [*S/12007*] on the recommendation of the Council of Ministers of the OAU. The present complaint is the sixth in a series of complaints brought before the Security Council by Angola itself.

49. On five previous occasions, the Council responded positively to these complaints by adopting resolutions strongly condemning South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained invasion of Angola through the international Territory of Namibia, which it occupies illegally. At the same time, the Council demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African military forces from Angolan territory and called upon the Government of South Africa to pay compensation to the people of Angola for the resulting damage and destruction. In its resolution 428 (1978), the Council decided to meet again

> "in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola . . . in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof".

50. It is a matter of regret, however, that when, in August 1981, South Africa once again invaded and occupied a part of Angolan territory, the Council was not able to take the required action to secure the withdrawal of the South African troops. The lack of effective response by the Council to South Africa's aggressive action against Angola at the time has encouraged South Africa to continue its aggressive activities with impunity and emboldened it to remain in occupation of parts of Angola's territory.

51. In his statement before the Council on 16 December [*2504th meeting*], the representative of Angola reminded the Council of the aggression to which his country has been subjected since its independence on 11 November 1975 and what he called the full-scale war unleashed by South Africa against his country since 1981. He gave detailed information about the places where five South African battalions are at present deployed in Angola.

52. The reasons for South Africa's sustained aggressive activities against Angola and its continued occu-

pation of Angolan territory are well known. It is no secret that South Africa's actions against Angola are calculated to preserve its inhuman system of *apartheid*, perpetuate its control and domination of Namibia and intimidate the front-line States into not extending support to SWAPO and the liberation movements in South Africa.

53. In a vain attempt to justify its aggression against Angola, South Africa has claimed the right of hot pursuit of SWAPO freedom fighters inside Angolan territory. The United Nations has categorically rejected this claim. The United Nations has repeatedly called for early independence for Namibia and has accorded recognition to SWAPO as the true representative of the Namibian people. South Africa has no legitimate status or authority over Namibia. Its control of the Territory has been declared illegal by the United Nations. Accordingly, its actions undertaken from Namibian soil in the name of protecting Namibian interests are devoid of legality. They are aimed solely at consolidating South Africa's stranglehold over Namibia and its continued exploitation of the riches of that Territory.

54. The timing of the offer of disengagement made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa in his letter addressed to the Secretary-General [*S/16219, annex I*] raises the legitimate suspicion that it is tactical in nature and limited in objective. Its aim appears to be to avoid condemnation by the Council of South Africa's continued occupation of Angolan territory. It skirts the central issue of the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola's territory and instead holds out a promise of disengagement under conditions which, if accepted, would amount to the United Nations endorsing South Africa's purported justification of its lawless actions against Angola. If the offer had any credibility whatsoever, that has been destroyed by South Africa's dispatch of four columns of its armoured corps on an offensive in the Angolan province of Huila, immediately after announcing its disengagement proposal.

55. Non-interference in the internal affairs of States and non-acquisition of territory by force are quintessential principles of the Charter of the United Nations. These principles do not admit of any exception and must be applied with equal authority and force whenever and wherever foreign invasion or occupation takes place. In addressing itself to such violations of the Charter, the Council can fulfil its special responsibility under the Charter only by taking firm action in support of those principles.

56. Accordingly, the Council has the inescapable obligation to reiterate its strong condemnation of South Africa's aggression and continued occupation of part of Angola. Consistent with its previous decisions, the Council is required once again to demand the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of South Africa's occupation forces from the territory of Angola.

57. Having determined in the past that Angola has been a victim of aggression by South Africa and has suffered extensive loss of life and property, it is incumbent on the Council to reaffirm Angola's right to full compensation for those losses.

58. Pakistan will lend its unreserved support to any firm action by the Council aimed at ensuring South Africa's unconditional and speedy withdrawal from Angola which, in our view, would facilitate the early independence of Namibia and contribute towards the promotion of peace and security in the region.

59. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Mr. Emmeka Anyaoku. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

60. Mr. ANYAOKU (Nigeria): Mr. President, as this is the first time that I have spoken here since my appointment as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, I should like to begin by expressing my gratitude to you and to all the other representatives in the Council for this opportunity to make a statement here. I should also like to congratulate you warmly on your recent assumption of the presidency for the month of December.

61. The complaint that the Government of Angola has brought to the Council against the racist régime of South Africa is a serious and legitimate one. Since its attainment of independence in 1975, Angola has been the victim of persistent and blatant military aggression by the forces of the racist régime of South Africa. These attacks, which are clearly unprovoked, have culminated in the open invasion and occupation by South African forces of a substantial part of Angolan territory. Both the military attacks and the occupation of Angolan territory represent a violation of international law as well as of the Charter of the United Nations. They are also a clear threat to the peace and stability of the whole region of southern Africa, a vital part of the continent.

62. The racist régime of South Africa has sought to justify its irresponsible military attacks on Angola on several grounds. First, that its military operations were being undertaken in hot pursuit of freedom fighters of SWAPO near Angola's southern border. If that is the case, why did the racist régime not accept the offer made by the late President Agostinho Neto of Angola for the establishment of a demilitarized zone on the border between Namibia and Angola? South Africa does not share a border with Angola, and its use of Namibia—over which its Mandate was revoked by the United Nations—as a spring-board for military attacks against Angola is a gross violation of the international status of Namibia.

63. The racist régime has also sought to justify these reprehensible military attacks on the grounds that there are Cuban forces in Angola. But those forces went to Angola at the invitation of the Angolan Government, in its legitimate right of the exercise of self-defence. Even while the MPLA Government was assuming

power upon Angola's independence, the racist régime of South Africa, in collaboration with internal dissident forces and certain external interests, was already preparing the ground for the military subversion of the newly independent State.

64. Over the years, successive Governments of the Federal Republic of Nigeria have expressed profound concern and dismay over South Africa's invasion and occupation of Angola. We fully support the Government of Angola in the measures it has taken to seek protection and security for itself. We cannot accept the right which South Africa and its allies arrogate to themselves to intervene at will in the internal and external affairs of Angola. They have no right whatever to dictate to Angola on matters concerning its own national security and survival.

65. The recent decision of the Council to reject the so-called linkage between Namibia's independence and Cuban forces in Angola [*resolution 539 (1983)*] is not only timely but fully consistent with the basic principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. As the President of Nigeria, Shehu Shagari, said in a recent major statement on the southern Africa situation, Angola cannot legitimately be held hostage to a settlement in Namibia. There is a vital principle involved here for which, collectively, the international community has a moral responsibility. Military might by one State does not confer on it the right to dictate to others. There are other norms of international behaviour to which all States, big or small, powerful or weak, rich or poor, are bound. A breach of this basic principle is surely a prescription for international chaos and anarchy.

66. For far too long, the racist régime of South Africa, with the open connivance and support of some of its Western allies, has with impunity been on a military rampage in southern Africa. Thousands of innocent lives have been lost and billions of dollars' worth of property has been damaged. The national economy of Angola has been under constant siege by the persistent military attacks from South Africa. Restitution to Angola for this severe dislocation of its national economy is certainly due from South Africa.

67. In conclusion, let me say that Africa expects some action by the Council in calling South Africa to order. It expects that this draft resolution on Angola's complaints against South Africa [*S/16226*] will receive the careful and sympathetic consideration of the Council. Angola has for far too long been denied justice by those whose sinister motives have become only too apparent. I ask all the representatives on the Council to support this draft resolution, which is the result of very wide-ranging consultations.

68. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

69. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I am confident that you will lead the Council's deliberations to the best results, due to your long experience in the diplomatic and political field.

70. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to my friend, Mr. Gauci of Malta, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

71. This is not the first time the Council has met to consider South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola and occupation of part of its territory. I do not think that it will be the last, given South Africa's intransigent policy and the Council's failure to impose deterrent measures against it.

72. The people of Angola, which for many years fought and sacrificed thousands of lives to rid themselves of Portuguese colonialism, on the eve of independence found themselves threatened by a new colonialism, this time by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa which, as soon as it heard of the independence of Angola, sent its forces over Angola's borders to terrorize the Angolan people and put them under racist colonialist sway, as it did with the people of Namibia. Despite the failure of its first attempt, it persisted in its repeated acts of aggression and violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, even occupying part of its territory permanently through the use of gangs of UNITA [*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*] and mercenaries to undertake acts of subversion inside Angola in order to undermine the country's infrastructure and prevent it from achieving social and economic progress.

73. The facts relating to this question have been the subject of much correspondence addressed to the President of the Council by the representative of Angola, as well as of statements by the representative of Angola before this Council, the latest on 16 December [*2504th meeting*]. I need not dwell at length on the acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa; however, it may be useful to mention that the Council has repeatedly met to discuss the attacks by South Africa on Angola and other African States. Yet it has so far failed to take any measures to stop a repetition of those acts.

74. The racist régime continues its defiance of United Nations resolutions, its attacks on neighbouring countries, the violation of their sovereignty and its continued occupation of Namibia and parts of Angola. It has continuously attempted to fabricate threadbare pretexts to justify its acts of aggression and, through its friends, to prevent the Council from adopting any measures which might compel it to comply with the will of the international community, put an end to its occupation of Namibia and stop its aggression against neighbouring countries. The latest of these manoeuvres is the

message sent by the representative of the racist régime to the Secretary-General [*S/16219*] following Angola's request that a meeting of the Council be convened. This manoeuvre aims only at deceiving the Council and preventing it from fulfilling its responsibilities. The message says nothing new; it makes no mention of the withdrawal of the racist forces from Angolan territory, but rather confirms the insistence of the *apartheid* régime on the linkage of the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola and the independence of Namibia, a linkage which the international community has rejected as interference in Angola's internal affairs.

75. South African forces should be withdrawn from Angola forthwith and unconditionally. South Africa must also cease its attacks on neighbouring countries and declare its willingness to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, approved by the Council in resolution 435 (1978). The attempt to introduce matters which are extraneous to that resolution, such as the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola, can be regarded only as an attempt to delay Namibia's independence and to perpetuate the exploitation of its resources. Those who help the South African régime to persist in its policy must realize that they are helping the enemy of Africa. They must end their political hypocrisy and declare frankly whether they are on the side of Africa and its peoples and the right of the African peoples to live as human beings and to enjoy freedom and their fundamental rights, or are on the side of the *apartheid* régime and against the majority of the members of the international community.

76. Peace and security and Africa are threatened by the presence of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, its illegal occupation of Namibia and part of Angolan territory and its continuous attacks on the front-line States. The Council must fulfil its responsibility by taking the following measures to guarantee the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and all the other front-line States. First, the Security Council must condemn South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola and its occupation of part of Angolan territory, as well as its violation of Angola's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Secondly, it must ensure the prompt withdrawal of South African forces from Angolan territory. Thirdly, it must impose comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

77. Finally, I affirm Libya's solidarity with Angola and the other front-line States against the repeated attacks by the *apartheid* régime and its continuous violations of their sovereignty. I appeal to the members of the Council to take the necessary measures to stop this aggression and to ensure the withdrawal of the racist forces from all Angolan territory.

78. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mauritania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania wishes to express its satisfaction at seeing such a skilled diplomat as yourself, Sir, presiding over the Council for the month of December. Our country enjoys fruitful bilateral co-operation with your country, the Netherlands, within the European Community—Africa—Caribbean—Pacific framework, co-operation symbolic of what can and should be the relationship of equality and mutual interest between Africa and Europe.

80. I also congratulate my friend Victor Gauci, of Malta, who presided over the Council during the month of November with the discretion and skill for which he is known. I am particularly pleased to say this, since the personal actions of Mr. Gauci and the policies of Malta have always been distinguished by sympathy for the just causes of Africa and the Arab world, sympathy that we very much appreciate.

81. Finally, I thank all the members of the Council for having allowed us to take part in its important debates.

82. The international community must surely recognize that the Government and the brother people of Angola have for two years shown great patience when faced with the irresponsible and dangerous actions of South Africa, which threaten peace, security and international law.

83. We all know that since 1981, after a series of repeated raids into Angola, the racist South African régime has permanently occupied part of the national territory of that country, attempting to destabilize the régime, carrying out massive destruction of industrial and agricultural installations and committing intolerable atrocities.

84. The lame excuses used are too well known for me to need to go through them.

85. We are all familiar with the perverse theory that a solution to the Namibian crisis is to be found by aggression in Angola. I am sure that the Council has not been taken in by this. The only solution to that problem is the ending of the illegal usurpation of the Territory and the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination on the basis of resolution 435 (1978).

86. Painstaking attempts have been to find a reason for this violation of Angola's sovereignty and attack on its territorial integrity in the East-West confrontation.

87. In sum, through an amazing and inadmissible act of blackmail, Angola, the victim of an open attempt at destabilization, has been denied its sovereign right to ensure the security of its territory and the protection of its people in the way which the legitimate Government deems fit.

88. It goes without saying that the Council cannot accept such specious arguments or these hints at su-

pervision of Angola. The Council cannot be an accomplice in the creation of this vicious and astonishing confusion, especially as it knows the reality.

89. The reality is indeed quite different. As in the Middle East, where Israel uses a similar strategy to prevent the development of the countries of that region, South Africa bases its entire policy, and particularly its so-called security, on keeping the brother countries of southern Africa in a state of collective inferiority. This explains the attacks carried out from time to time on other front-line States—notably, Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana and Lesotho.

90. The ferocity and the persistence of the aggression against Angola are, moreover, a test of the capacity of the Organization and, primarily, of the Council to react and to deter.

91. What we are witnessing today in Angola and southern Africa is what we have already seen in Lebanon and the Middle East. The theatre of operations changes, but the pretexts for aggression remain the same, just as the claims of the aggressors are identical.

92. The racist, bellicose, intolerant ideology, which respects no rule of law and disregards the rights of others, their sovereignty and their security, insulting their past, trampling on their present and mortgaging their future, is the same. The indulgence with which it is viewed by the West and the encouragement of aggression it receives in the form of a flow of arms, money and men have the same sources. The only difference is that this ideology is called zionism in the Middle East and *apartheid* in the case that we are discussing today.

93. It is the duty of the international community, and primarily, the Council, to save Angola from the unhappy fate of brother Lebanon, a fate that the South African régime would like to mete out to it as part of its general undertaking of imposing and maintaining its hegemony in the region. Angola, which has only just emerged from the long night of colonialism through a difficult, devastating and exhausting war of liberation, now faces a new trial, which it is the last to desire. This is described with realism, but with great restraint, in the White Paper circulated by the Angolan Government [*S/16198, annex*].

94. Angola, which justifiably has great ambitions for economic and social development, has thus been diverted from this mission of peace and national construction by subversion inspired and maintained by South Africa, and by South Africa's usurpation of Angolan sovereignty over a large part of Angolan territory.

95. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and all universal understandings, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania reaffirms its active solidarity with Angola and its confidence in the toughness of this heroic fraternal people and of the other front-line States and all of Africa, in the face of the general efforts being made by the South African régime to destabilize and dominate the region.

96. Mauritania requests that the Council clearly and pointedly enjoin upon South Africa its compliance with international law and the repeated decisions of the United Nations for the unconditional, complete and immediate evacuation of its forces from Angolan territory, in accordance with Council resolutions 387 (1976), 428 (1978), 447 (1979) and 475 (1980).

97. Mauritania furthermore would like to see the Council emphasize the imperative need for all to observe strict respect for the sovereignty of Angola, its territorial integrity and the unity of its people.

98. Our country believes that the Council should firmly condemn South Africa's policy of State terrorism in southern Africa, and most particularly its overall efforts to destabilize Angola by aerial bombardment, armed incursions and the recruitment, financing, arming, training, conscription and political indoctrination of mercenaries of all nationalities who have been drawn together under the UNITA banner.

99. The Council should call on South Africa's allies to withhold all technological, financial and political support for South Africa's unconscionable occupation of part of Angolan territory.

100. On another level, because of the incalculable damage suffered by the Angolan economy as a result of the aforementioned aggression, the Council should request South Africa to furnish fair compensation for the consequences of its acts.

101. In so doing, our community of nations will have demonstrated to those who do not cherish peace and do not respect the Charter that crime does not pay, and thus will have provided concrete and effective evidence of its sympathy for the victims—in this case Angola—of flagrant aggression.

102. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania would like to place particular stress on the responsibility borne by the Western Powers to restrain the unbridled ambitions of South Africa and to help in the reconstruction of Angola. The Western countries, whose contact group is working so closely here with our brothers in the front-line States and Nigeria to find a peaceful solution in Namibia, play a decisive role in creating an atmosphere of calm conducive to an overall reconciliation of the enormous contradictions in the region which, for the most part, are rooted in South Africa's aberrant policy of institutionalized racism and aggression.

103. There are many strong links and a great community of interests between Africa and the countries of the Western contact group. Yet for historic, strategic and

economic reasons, those countries have close relations with South Africa as well.

104. We continue to believe that in the relations between the Western countries and Africa, reason, interest, justice and friendship will prevail over the facile tendency—tempting, but precarious—to seek a privileged and exclusive alliance with the South African régime, thus condoning its adventurist exploits, particularly in Angola.

105. We prefer to lay a wager on the wisdom of the Western Powers, particularly the United States, and on their genuine desire to bring about and to consolidate in southern Africa an atmosphere of peace and concord through justice, good-neighbourliness and the triumph of human rights and the rights of peoples.

106. Today, in the Council, in the case of the illegal occupation of part of Angola, an opportunity has been afforded to this group of Powers and to all the other members to lay emphasis on the importance of the Council's essential role: to maintain peace and security in southern Africa, in all of Africa and throughout the world.

107. While calm should prevail here over partisan passions and ideological splits which have nothing to do with South Africa's outrageous attacks against human rights and the rights of peoples, it must not numb your sense of justice and your formidable collective responsibility.

108. By acting in this way, the Council will provide proof that it can and will shoulder the full measure of responsibility conferred upon it by the Charter, which was drawn up as a sound and universal reaction to the Fascist practices of a régime of which South Africa is one of the last heirs.

109. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

110. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the Council for this opportunity to participate in this debate. At the same time, I should like to express to you, Mr. President, our pleasure at seeing you presiding over the deliberations of the Council. To your many personal qualities must be added the fact that you represent the Netherlands, a State with which Argentina has traditional and growing bonds of friendship. We are sure that under your leadership the work of the Council in December will be successful and will make a real contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

111. Our salutations also go to your predecessor, Mr. Gauci, who so efficiently conducted the proceedings of the Council in the month of November.

112. The continuing occupation of part of the sovereign territory of Angola by South Africa is a source of great concern to the international community. This illegal act, which is a serious violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, endangering regional and international peace and security, is another manifestation of the destabilizing foreign policy that Pretoria has been carrying out against its neighbours. Moreover, it coincides with South Africa's refusal to allow the genuine independence of Namibia and is part of the broader objective of perpetuating the *apartheid* régime, which the General Assembly has rightly described as "a crime against humanity".

113. One of the fundamental aspects of the foreign policy of Argentina is scrupulous respect for the principles of the Charter. The Charter expressly prohibits the use of force in international relations and enshrines the fundamental right of States to independence and territorial integrity. Absolute condemnation of racial discrimination is implicit in the Charter.

114. South Africa has constantly violated these guiding principles. Argentina vigorously condemns this conduct, and we join those who demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Angolan territory. Together with the overwhelming majority of the international community, we believe that aggression against Angola, the policy of destabilizing other African countries, the unlawful occupation of Namibia and the maintenance of the system of *apartheid* fully justify the Council's adopting measures such as those set forth in Chapter VII of the Charter. Such action by the Council would merely be compliance with its fundamental responsibility to maintain international peace and security.

115. Indeed, Pretoria's stubborn clinging to its aggressive racist policies leaves the Organization without any choice. South Africa cannot expect that countries committed to respect for human dignity and equality among nations will forever remain indifferent to the continuing tragedy in southern Africa. Angola and the other countries subject to Pretoria's frequent acts of aggression, as well as the oppressed people of Namibia and South Africa, may rest assured of the responsible, effective support of Argentina in their just struggle to achieve the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter in their region of the world.

116. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): I should like to begin my statement by thanking you, Mr. President, and through you all the members of the Council, for having allowed my delegation to take part in this important and urgent debate. At the same time I wish to congratulate you personally on your assumption of the presidency for the month of December.

118. Allow me also to extend our sincere congratulations to Mr. Victor Gauci, of Malta, for having so ably presided over the work of the Council during the month of November.

119. It is more than two years since the South African military began a massive invasion that involved more than 45,000 troops. The Council was convened in August 1981 (*S/14647*) to address itself to the then rapidly deteriorating situation and to take steps to avoid a confrontation of greater magnitude by calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the invading forces. That was certainly not the first meeting called specifically to discuss South Africa's aggression against Angola. In March 1976, the Council adopted resolution 387 (1976); in May 1978, it adopted resolution 428 (1978); in 1979, the Council adopted resolutions 447 (1979) and 454 (1979), in March and November, respectively. Resolution 475 (1980) was subsequently adopted, in June 1980. In all those resolutions the Council condemned the acts of aggression committed against Angola. The Council called upon South Africa to cease those acts of aggression and scrupulously to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country.

120. However, the meetings of the Council in August 1981 on the same question [*2296th to 2300th meetings*] were different from the previous ones at which those resolutions were adopted. In magnitude and purpose, the August 1981 invasion signified a new dimension in the hostility of the *apartheid* régime against Angola. Indeed, the continuing occupation of parts of Angolan territory consequent upon that invasion testifies to this new dimension. South Africa, having failed in June 1975 to prevent the coming to power of the MPLA Government, had regrouped its regular army and mercenary forces to invade and to occupy Angola and to create so-called new facts on the Angolan political and security scene.

121. In 1981, the meeting was also different in that this time a resolution which could have upheld not only the rights of Angola but also the principles and purposes of the Charter was vetoed by the United States [*S/14664/Rev.2*]. The implications of that position are all too clear today. For South Africa, politically reinforced by the veto cast in the face of a clear-cut case of aggression, escalated its military operations and today is still illegally occupying the southern parts of Angola. Evidently further political concessions to and engagements with the *apartheid* régime have also reinvigorated its opposition to the independence of Namibia.

122. The fact that more than two years have elapsed since August 1981 and the Council has not taken action is itself regrettable, for while the passage of time has meant the suffering of innocent Angolan civilians, women and children, permitting aggression against an independent sovereign State Member of the United Nations to continue for so long without any attempt to redress the situation speaks of the sad story of the efficacy of the Council.

123. The Council has been informed by the representative of Angola in his statement here last Friday [*2504th meeting*], as well as by the White Paper on Acts of Aggression by the Racist South African Régime [*S/16198, annex*], about the full impact of the continued occupation. The extent of material infrastructural damage and dislocation of various sectors of the Angolan economy, as well as the loss of life and human torment, can certainly not be fully assessed. Even more, their short-term and long-term effects will certainly have devastatingly negative impacts on the Angolan people and economy.

124. The Council is called upon to consider an illegal act which contravenes international law and principles and violates the Charter of the United Nations. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter requires all Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State and from acting in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

125. The Council is only too familiar with the regard the *apartheid* régime has for the Charter. *Apartheid* South Africa is the embodiment of aggression. The elaborate system of the *apartheid* laws and the brutal force needed to enforce them are a standing aggression against the black population inside South Africa. Through the colonial occupation maintained over the people of Namibia, that people have become perpetual victims of *apartheid* aggression. The countless acts of sabotage, armed incursions, assassinations and other acts of destabilization against the independent African States in the region all epitomize aggression.

126. South Africa's occupation of Angola constitutes a continuing act of aggression. It has, as a result of that occupation, imposed a reign of terror against the innocent civilian inhabitants of that territory. The Kassinga massacre of May 1978, carried out by the South African military against a helpless refugee population, and the full-scale invasion of August 1981, for example, demonstrate the sustained and prolonged violation of the provisions of the Charter, the logical consequence of which should be the application of the provisions of Chapter VII, which deals with the actions to be taken with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression.

127. The Council has the duty to see to it that aggression is not allowed to go unpunished. The legal position of the international community has been adequately set forth in the various principles of international law, in the Charter and in the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In particular, the duty of every State to refrain from the use of force to prevent the exercise by a people of their right to self-determination and independence has been underlined. Accordingly, the right of Angola, or any other country for that matter, to use every available means to ensure the exercise of that right is inalienable. Even if it is in the use of force in seeking help to ensure the exercise of

that right, there is justification. The Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of October 1970, reinforces that right as provided under Article 51 of the Charter.

128. The fundamental question that needs to be asked is why Angola is occupied today. South Africa's hostility to Angola dates back to the battle by the Angolan people, under the leadership of MPLA, for genuine independence. Its failure to impose upon the Angolan people a puppet leadership was obviously a resounding defeat of the *apartheid* ambitions. Beginning in 1975, when the *apartheid* régime launched the first major attack in a series of other major military campaigns that were to follow, until today, South Africa has not accepted the independence of Angola.

129. It saw in it the removal of another protective buffer of *apartheid* which, while cushioned by Portuguese colonialism, had nurtured the dreams of invincibility. Hence, be it in the continuing occupation of Angola or in any acts of aggression and destabilization against the independent States in the region, the aim is clear. It is nothing more than a desperate attempt to reverse history through acts of sabotage, destabilization and aggression.

130. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the international territory of Namibia is certainly a major factor in the occupation of Angolan territory. The occupation itself, characterized by indiscriminate destruction of the civilian infrastructure and other vital sectors of the economy, is aimed at the total destruction of Angola's economy and weakening its ability and resolve to support the Namibian people for the achievement of their independence. In the process, the *apartheid* régime hopes to achieve the capitulation of Angola and proceed with the bantustanization of Namibia. The use of SWAPO combatants as an excuse for the military occupation should, therefore, be seen in that context. Obviously, for political expediency, the *apartheid* régime does not and will not address itself to the real issues of *apartheid* and its illegal occupation of Namibia or Angola. Instead it opts to dwell on irrelevant issues. It is not Angola or any other country that is responsible for the resistance of the Namibian people against colonial occupation and racism. Rather, it is the brutality, savagery and unacceptability of the *apartheid* system itself which makes struggle against it inevitable, and South Africa and its friends now know that very well. They also know that no matter the frequency or magnitude of invasions or occupations, in the final analysis they will not create safety for *apartheid*. Like any dehumanizing system, it is bound to be dismantled —whether the diehard white racists in South Africa like it or not.

131. *Apartheid* arrogance and contempt for the United Nations is nothing new to the international community. The claim of the representative of the *apartheid* régime—a régime which enslaves millions of black people in South Africa and Namibia and is committing acts of aggression and occupying parts of Angolan territory, annihilating village populations and committing untold atrocities in the process—that these hideous acts are perpetrated for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom of Africa is both contemptuous and cynical. This kind of perversion of logic and justification of aggression could come only from the *apartheid* régime.

132. The Council, as well as the overwhelming majority of Members of the Organization, maintain that the policies of *apartheid*, the occupation of Namibia and that of Angola are all illegal. Indeed, the very régime itself has been declared illegal. The various resolutions condemning the acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola adopted by the Council between 1976 and 1980 leave no doubt whatsoever about the illegal presence of the *apartheid* régime on Angolan soil. The General Assembly's withdrawal, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 September 1966, of the South African Mandate over Namibia and the numerous resolutions and decisions condemning the continued *apartheid* occupation of that Territory, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,[1] also provide clear proof of the position of the international community. Equally, the correct decision taken by the General Assembly in 1974, and subsequently reaffirmed at its every session, to reject the credentials of the representatives of the *apartheid* régime underlines the conviction of the international community that the Pretoria régime is totally illegal. Indeed the Council itself in 1974 took up consideration of the question of the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa [*1796th to 1798th and 1800th to 1804th meetings*]. Obviously, had it not been for the same friends of South Africa who continue to underwrite *apartheid*, the Council was on the correct track in reconsidering its continued association with that régime.

133. Perhaps it is also pertinent to point out at this juncture that it does not surprise us that we are told that the empty pronouncements of the *apartheid* régime about the so-called disengagement of the occupation troops in Angola constitute a so-called positive development. We heard the same concerning the internationally condemned so-called constitutional dispensations only a few weeks ago. Yet the international community is aware of the purpose of those pronouncements. They are aimed at confusing the current debate, since, through sending such diversionary signals, they will have provided ground to be used as a pretext by those who in any case seem to acquiesce in South Africa's occupation of parts of Angola, to divert the focus of the Council from the demand for South Africa's immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Angolan territory. What needs to be dwelt on is not any so-called disengagement of troops or any related activity. Rather, it is why the South African forces are in Angola in the first place. The question before the Council is the invasion

and continued occupation of Angolan territory by the *apartheid* régime, and no attempt should be made to obscure that fact.

134. Angola has come before the Council to seek justice. Hence the Council cannot afford the luxury of indifference to what is, according to the Charter, an illegal use of force in obvious and contemptuous disregard of the legal norms of conduct. Hesitation to take effective action against the continuing South African aggression will have serious consequences both for the people of Angola and southern Africa and for the prestige and authority of the Council. To remain silent or not to act concerning aggression would be a tragic omission with far-reaching consequences for the Charter. We seek from the Council nothing more than observance of the Charter by the racist régime. Accordingly, we call upon the Council, at the minimum, to condemn, in the strongest manner possible, the continued occupation of Angolan territory and demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal by South Africa of all its occupation forces and scrupulous respect by that régime for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the People's Republic of Angola.

135. At the same time, the Council must call upon all States to desist from any action that undermines the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Angola. It should also demand full and prompt compensation by South Africa for the destruction of property and loss of life brought about by that country's continued occupation.

136. Angola has suffered the more than two years of occupation which has been allowed to continue, partly by the vacillation of the Council in taking effective action. Other African States in the region continue to fall victim to South African aggression for the same reasons. The Council has an obligation to see to it that effective action is taken, since the decision it will take at this series of meetings will have a significant effect both on the future behaviour of South Africa and on the security of the independent African States neighbouring the *apartheid* régime. Consequently, the Council must commit itself to the adoption of effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter in the event that South Africa persists in its aggression.

137. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mozambique, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

138. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, I thank you and the other members of the Council for affording me the opportunity to address the Council.

139. May I, at the outset, tell you how happy I am to see you presiding over the affairs of the Council for the month of December. Despite its alliances, your country, the Netherlands, and your generous people have been able to understand the struggle and aspiration of peoples for liberty, independence, freedom, equality and justice. I am happy to put on record the special relationships that have obtained between your generous, hard-working people and Government and the people of Mozambique since the inception of our struggle for national liberation. We shall never forget the diplomatic, material, financial and moral support that your Government and people have willingly rendered not only to the people of Mozambique, but also to the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and other such countries.

140. I wish to seize this opportunity to praise the work done by the Angola Committee and the Eduardo Mondlane Foundation, both of the Netherlands. Your country's constructive attitude on the question of the establishment of the new international economic order is praiseworthy. The aversion of your people and Government to the inhuman doctrines and practices of *apartheid* is well known and appreciated by Africa and the whole world. I hope, and am convinced, that in the future we shall be afforded the opportunity to continue our relations of trust.

141. I take this opportunity to thank your predecessor in the presidency for the able manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month. Malta and Mozambique, belonging as they do to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, share many common anxieties and aspirations.

142. Once again the belligerent South African racists are in the dock, not because the world community takes special pleasure in putting them there, but because racist South Africans seem especially to enjoy being in the dock. They are hardened, perpetual offenders. Their behaviour can be likened to that of a hardened, callous criminal who does not feel comfortable outside the prison walls. He feels so uncomfortable that as his prison term approaches its end he becomes very restless and begins plotting and designing the next crime. No sooner is he released than he commits another crime, and he is back in prison.

143. Let us face the facts, however hard, unpalatable and ugly they may be. The racist clique in Pretoria is composed of hardened, unrepentant criminals who are no different from other well-known international organized crime groups, except perhaps that they have organized something resembling and having the appearance of Government—when taken at face value, that is. In reality South Africa is run by a Masonic house known as the *broederbond*. The racist South Africans are Nazi-Fascist in look, outlook, ideology, practice and behaviour.

144. Just look at the self-styled spokesman of the South African racists. Does he not remind members of those faceless, ugly Hitlerite Germans? I am sorry he is not here. Just imagine him as he sat here and bragged about the terrorist act of planting bombs in an apartment building in Maputo, set to explode in the still of the night. To make it savoury, he called it a commando

raid and proudly proclaimed that the act was to be repeated. What is the difference between the *broederbond* on the one hand and the death squads and *la mano blanca* on the other? What is the difference between planting a bomb in an apartment building in Maseru, Mbabane, Lusaka, Gaborone, Harare, on the one hand, and planting a bomb in a parliament building, on the other?

145. Despite the world outcry and condemnation of the continued occupation, colonization and brutal treatment of Namibia by the racist Boers, the same self-styled spokesman had the temerity to assert in this chamber not long ago that the Boers' policy enjoyed the support of the world community. Does the Council remember that? I am sure it does. Only a hardened criminal or a Nazi—which boils down to the same thing—would unashamedly, blatantly and brazenly tell such a lie to such a distinguished, enlightened, learned, knowledgeable and respected body as the Council. If racist South Africans can tell the Council lies in the full knowledge that they are nothing but lies, and are fully aware that the Security Council is as fully aware, or even more fully aware, that it is being fed blatant lies, what happens if and when they sense that people may not be in possession of all the facts? The fabrication and spreading of lies is one of the major characteristics of Nazis.

146. Only last Friday [*2504th meeting*], the same self-styled spokesman had the stomach, nay the courage, to throw stones at a neighbour's concrete house, inhabiting as he does a glass house—nay, a house made of soap bubbles—and to try to show, by innuendo and insinuation, that the neighbour was not democratic. When I heard this I was at first tempted to say that those people were completely out of their minds, but later I kept wondering whether those people had minds at all. They may have lost the little mind they may have had in the past. If their mind is completely gone, it would be interesting to know at what point in time the loss was effected and completed.

147. Last Friday we were also told by the same self-styled Boer spokesman, but this time carrying aloft the banner of the whole of the African continent, that the African peoples reject a certain ideology which the racist South Africans love so much. For fear of a digression that may take us too far from our main target, I am going to refrain from discussing the matter now. Suffice it to say that the spokesman very conveniently and comfortably forgot to mention the fact that we Africans love *apartheid* to the point of unlimited hatred of it. And, by design or by mere chance, he also forgot to remind the Council—or thought there was no need to remind it—of the fact that we Africans are not alone in this intense hatred of *apartheid*. Indeed, the whole world, including outer space and the moon—at least during the time there are astronauts there—has an intense aversion to and horror of the *apartheid* policy.

148. The Boers are now posing as defenders of Africa. Ask the people of South Africa what that means; ask the people of Sharpeville, ask the people of so many Mangopes, ask the schoolchildren of Soweto, ask Steve Biko and Niel Agget, ask the thousands of prisoners in the Boers' jails, ask the people of Lesotho, ask the people of Zambia, ask the people of Zimbabwe, ask Bishop Desmond Tutu and millions of others who are without determined citizenship in the country of their own birth; ask the peoples of Botswana, of Swaziland, of Namibia, of Angola, of Seychelles, of Zaire, of Nigeria, of Mozambique, ask the people of the whole world.

149. Hitlerite Germans and racist South Africans are kith and kin in ideology and share many things in common. The Nazis considered themselves to be from a superior race and to be the chosen and to have had bestowed upon them a divine mission by God. The whole world had to be conquered, and all inferior races gassed to death and destroyed. Gruesome experiments were carried out upon human skin, flesh and mind. The Jews were the first victims, but others were to follow suit. A world war was unleashed, and more than 50 million souls were lost before the Nazis could be vanquished and tamed.

150. The Boers are, without any shadow of doubt, Hitler's admirers and disciples. They actively supported and fought alongside the Nazis. Just as the Nazis did in their time, the Boers consider themselves as belonging to a superior race, chosen by God to defend his kingdom. The blacks, Asians and so-called Coloureds are from inferior races, albeit races of differing degrees of inferiority. This ideology finds its highest expression in the policy and practice of *apartheid*.

151. Witness the humiliation, brutalization and mass murder of Jews by Hitler and the humiliation, brutalization and mass murder of the so-called non-whites by South African racists in Sharpeville, Soweto, Kassinga and so on, and tell me the difference between Hitler and Botha.

152. Witness the mass removal of Africans from their ancestral lands, from the Inyangas, from the Mangopes, from other whites-only areas to barren and overcrowded land. Should it be mentioned that almost the entire black population of more than 24 million souls, or more than 70 per cent of the South African population, is to be affected by this inhuman, heartless exercise of mass removal? Should we be reminded that only 13 per cent of the most barren land has been reserved for these more than 70 per cent? Do we know that over 2 million men, women and children have already gone through this experience? Do we understand that the so-called bantustans are for Africans what ghettos were for Jews?

153. In those ghettos Africans can hardly make a living. There, malnutrition and disease are the order of the day. Death visits 50 per cent of the children under the age of five. In other words, the gas chamber has been superseded, and in its stead malnutrition, hunger

and disease are being used to wipe out the African population. In the ghettos a campaign of sterilization of the population is in the testing stage. Ways and means of spreading deadly diseases among the Africans are being developed, tested and experimented with.

154. In the so-called white areas not less than 200,000 people are arrested every year for violating pass laws.

155. Their race-classification laws would be nothing but a laughing-stock were it not for the extreme and acute sufferings they entail for Africans. Besides the well-known races—white, black, Asian and so-called Coloured—there are honorary whites, the best known of them being the Japanese. But there are also honorary black whites, these being foreign blacks who, for one reason or another, the racists want to shield from some of their rawest and crudest racial laws. As the General Assembly session draws to a close, some of our colleagues may be travelling through racist South Africa to their respective countries, and during the few hours that they will be in racist South Africa all of them, as if by a hidden magic, will turn white, including the blackest of the black among them. They will be declared to be honorary whites; the title will be conferred upon them. As soon as they cross the border, their blackness will immediately return to them.

156. Taking a cue from their Nazi brethren, although less ambitious than the latter, the Boers have arrogated to themselves the right to intervene militarily in any country south of the Sahara if their interests are threatened. An array of ghosts is always invented to justify their military aggression: an African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) office here, an ANC base there, a bomb placed in Pretoria or in Windhoek, the presence of hostile forces there. Racist South Africa has always viewed with grave concern the attainment and consolidation of independence by African countries as a threat to its *apartheid* policies and to its very survival. In the 1960s, it was actively engaged in the tragic events that took place in the Congo, today Zaire. The secessionist Katangese had the racist Boers' blessing. As a staunch supporter of the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, racist South Africa strenuously opposed the attainment of independence by Zambia and Malawi.

157. When Ian Smith illegally and unilaterally declared the independence of Southern Rhodesia in 1965, the South African racists sent their regular armed forces to prop him up. When, in the 1960s, things became really unbearable for the Portuguese in Angola, the Boers, together with the Portuguese colonial troops, created the bands of Angolan traitors they support to this very day. And when those traitors failed to take over power in Luanda in 1975, they sent their armies and European mercenaries to invade that country, and this prompted the Angolans to seek military assistance from friendly countries. Ignominiously defeated, the racist South Africans had hurriedly to make their forces of aggression retreat, but their dreams of putting their stooges in power in Luanda did not die with their retreat.

158. Tired of being colonized, the Mozambican people took up arms in 1964, and immediately the Boers came to the aid of the Portuguese colonialists. Being hard-core racists, and sure of their racial superiority, the young South African soldiers at first took no cover when fired upon and marched on, shouting, "Come on, boy. Come on, boy." Of course the boys did come, in the form of bullets, and as a result many were killed. The contingent was immediately withdrawn.

159. During the sad and tragic events that took place in Nigeria with the attempt at secession in Biafra, the Boers lost no opportunity and were there, feverishly trying to weaken the country.

160. As the people and Governments of southern Africa, individually or severally, are engaged in a heroic struggle to rid themselves of the scourge and residue of colonialism, as they prepare to take off towards a future of wider horizons and better standards of life, as they strive to overcome backwardness and misery, they find themselves subjected to naked and unprovoked acts of aggression, economic pressure, sabotage, occupation. Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique are the victims of constant direct aggression or of bandits, armed, trained, equipped, financed and supplied by racist South Africa. Even defenceless, tiny but proud Lesotho was not able to escape the ire of the bloodthirsty racist South Africans. Recently the Boers resorted to brutal aggression against and blockading of that peaceful country.

161. Even countries as far afield as Kenya and Seychelles had an unwanted taste of the bitter pill that racist South Africa constitutes, as the tragic happenings that have taken place in those two countries in the last two years have vividly demonstrated. There was no conceivable threat to the racists coming from Seychelles. What prompted the invasion? Could the racist South Africans have suspected the existence of tigers in Seychelles that could one day swim the Indian Ocean and land at the Cape of Good Hope and devour their little children and cattle?

162. A few days ago I was told an Arab fable. One day a cat and a mouse were travelling on a ship without each knowing of the presence of the other. After several weeks of voyaging through high seas where no land was discernible, the cat noticed the mouse. As we all know, cats are very fond of eating mice. So the cat devised a provocation strategy, accusing the mouse of throwing sand at it. The mouse tried in vain to convince the cat that that was not possible, for they had been surrounded by sea water, and only sea water, for several weeks. The cat was not there for that kind of reasoning and jumped upon the poor mouse. I leave it to each one of the members of the Council to conclude the story.

163. No other country has borne the brunt of the South African racists' instinctive aggressiveness as Angola has. Although they retreated from Angolan soil after their defeat in 1976, they continued to support Angolan traitors until 1981, when, after the failure of their stooges, they decided to return to Angola; and they have been there constantly for the last two years, bringing untold suffering, death and destruction. Economic infrastructures such as roads and bridges are being destroyed. Even factories producing food and textiles could not escape the fury of the South African racists. Whole towns have been wiped out. It is estimated that so far Angola has lost $10 billion.

164. Last Friday [*2504th meeting*], we were offered disengagement [*S/16219, annex*]—whatever that means—in exchange for something that would guarantee racist South Africa's colonization of Namibia. Of the three forces, two never intended in the past nor do they intend in the future to set foot in Namibia. Only SWAPO is waging a struggle for national liberation in that country. There can be no disengagement, for there was no engagement in the first place. The racist South Africans seem to have forgotten whom they are engaged to. Or do they want to be engaged to several men at the same time with a view to practising polyandry?

165. The naked and unprovoked aggression against Angola is illegal and unlawful in international law and international practice. It is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

166. Africa, through the Manifesto on Southern Africa,[2] adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its sixth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 9 September 1969 and numerous other pronouncements, has offered a blueprint for a peaceful solution to the problems afflicting southern Africa. Racist South Africa has chosen to bite the peaceful hand we extended to it. The disengagement offer, coming as it did on the eve of the present debate in the Security Council, is a disingenuous ploy and should be dismissed outright with all the contempt it rightly deserves.

167. The Council, I am sure, will not fail to register the fact that racist South Africa has at long last admitted that it is waging a war of aggression against Angola.

168. Under your wise guidance, Mr. President, I am convinced that the Council will not fail to condemn the Boers for their aggression against and occupation of parts of southern Angola nor to call for the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of racist South Africa troops from that country.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店查问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—March 1992—2,050